

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-9, 14-22, and 26-33 have been withdrawn.  
Claims 11-13 and 23-25 have not been amended herein, and claim 10 has been amended herein.

Claims 10-13, 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Levine (U.S. 6,965,875).

Amended independent claim 1 recites in part as follows:

**"receiving a request at the second computer**  
for information about a product **from a first**  
**computer** on the network,

**sending from the second computer** an  
information code and information relating to  
the first and/or second computer **to a third**  
**computer** on the network **after the second**  
**computer receives the request**, the information  
code being associated with one or more  
characteristics of the product,

determining whether the second computer is  
authorized to receive from the third computer  
a respective value for each of the one or more  
characteristics,

**sending from the third computer to the second**  
**computer the respective value of each**  
**characteristic associated with the information**  
**code which was determined to be authorized**,  
and not sending from the third computer to the  
second computer the respective value of each  
characteristic associated with the information  
code which was determined not to be  
authorized, and

sending the respective value of each  
authorized characteristic from the second  
computer to the first computer." (Emphasis  
added.)

In explaining the above 102 rejection with regard to claim 10, the Examiner appears to rely on Fig. 1 (in particular, items 120 and 130 thereof), Figs. 2 and 3, and lines 20-40 of column 5 of Levine for disclosing the above-identified features of claim 10. It is respectfully submitted that such portions of Levine do not appear to specifically disclose "receiving a request at the second computer for information about a product from a first computer. . ." and "sending from the second computer an information code and information relating to the first and/or second computer to a third computer on the network after the second computer receives the request . . . ," as in claim 10.

In other words, in the method of claim 10, a request for information about a product may be sent from a first computer and received at a second computer; and, the second computer may send an information code and other information to a third computer after the second computer receives the request. As an example, and with reference to Fig. 1 of the present application, the first computer may be personal computer 60, the second computer may be that associated with dealer server 70, and the third computer may be that associated with manufacturer server 71. In this example, a user may send a request from his/her personal computer 60 to the dealer server 70; and, the dealer server 70 may send an information code and other information to the manufacturer server 71 after the second computer receives the request (in which the sent information code and other information may be utilized in obtaining the information eventually sent to the user in response to his/her request). (See paragraphs 0029-0036 of the present application.)

Although the system of Levine appears to have at least three computers (i.e., one for the wholesaler 100, one for each distributor 120, and one for each customer 130), Levine does not

appear to disclose that such computers interact in the same manner as that set forth in claim 10. For example, Levine does not appear to disclose that a customer 130 computer sends a request to the distributor 120 computer and that the distributor 120 computer sends an information code and other information to the wholesaler 100 computer after the second computer receives the request, in which such information code is utilized in obtaining information to be sent to the customer 130. Instead, it appears that the customer 130 must log into the system of Levine whereupon it is determined what type of user they are (i.e., a customer, a distributor or a potential customer) (see lines 24-47 of column 4 of Levine). After such determination, then the user may have certain options available to the user. For example, Fig. 3 of Levine illustrates options available to a customer and Fig. 4 of Levine illustrates options available to a distributor. In step 325 of Fig. 3 it appears that once a user is determined to be a customer, such user has access to the distributor's home page and other information pertaining thereto.

Accordingly, in the system of Levine, it appears that once a user is determined to be a customer such user may access information directly from the distributor. As such, it appears that the distributor 120 does not send an information code and other information to the wholesaler 100 after the distributor 120 receives a request from the customer 130.

Claims 11-13 and 23-24 are dependent from independent claim 10. Accordingly, it is also respectfully submitted that dependent claims 11-13 and 23-24 are distinguishable from Levine as applied by the Examiner for at least the reasons previously described.

Claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Levine in view of Official Notice.

Claim 25 is dependent from independent claim 10. Accordingly, it is also respectfully submitted that dependent claim 25 is distinguishable from Levine as applied by the Examiner for at least the reasons previously described. The Examiner does not appear to rely on Official Notice to overcome the above-described deficiencies of Levine. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claim 25 is distinguishable from the applied combination of Levine and Official Notice.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been overcome, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: August 8, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Dennis M. Smid

Registration No.: 34,930  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicants